

REMARKS

Claims 21-23, 25 and 42-70 are pending in the application, with claims 21, 47 and 56 being independent. Claims 21, 47 and 56 have been amended and claims 65-70 have been added. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the application at Fig. 17B and page 15, lines 17-19, which notes "As shown in Fig. 17B, although the lattice images with different directions collide with each other at the crystal grain boundaries" No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 21, 42, 43, 47, 51 and 52 were rejected as being anticipated by Iwasaki (JP 08-288515A). Independent claims 21 and 47 have been amended to recite that a semiconductor film has a first crystal region, a second crystal region and a grain boundary located between the first crystal region and the second crystal region, and that a first lattice image corresponding to the first crystal region has a first direction different from a second direction of a second lattice image corresponding to the second crystal region. By contrast, in Iwasaki, crystals grow in one lateral direction in a semiconductor film comprising a source region, a drain region and a channel formation region. Thus, Iwasaki does not describe or suggest that two lattice images sandwiching a grain boundary have directions different from each other. Accordingly, for at least this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 56, 60 and 61 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Iwasaki in view of Inoue (U.S. Patent No. 6,153,893). Claim 56 has been amended to recite the features added to claims 21 and 47. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for the reasons noted above and because Inoue, which is cited as showing a low concentration impurity region, does not remedy the failure of Iwasaki to describe or suggest these features.

Claims 22 and 48, which depend from claims 21 and 47, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Iwasaki in view of Erhart (U.S. Patent No. 5,572,211), and claim 57, which depends from claim 56, has been rejected as being unpatentable over Iwasaki in view of Inoue and Erhart. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections for the reasons noted above and because Erhart, which is cited as showing capacitors in an active matrix

display, does not remedy the failure of Iwasaki and Inoue to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims.

Claims 23, 25, 46, 49, 50 and 55, which depend from claims 21 and 47, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Iwasaki in view of den Boer (U.S. Patent No. 5,539,219), and claims 58, 59 and 64, which depend from claim 56, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Iwasaki in view of Inoue and den Boer. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejection for the reasons noted above and because den Boer, which is cited as showing a liquid crystal between pixel electrodes and opposite electrodes, does not remedy the failure of Iwasaki and Inoue to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims.

Claims 44, 45, 53 and 54, which depend from claims 21 and 47, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Iwasaki in view of Kobayashi (U.S. Patent No. 3,925,803), and claims 62 and 63, which depend from claim 56, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Iwasaki in view of Inoue and Kobayashi. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections for the reasons noted above and because Kobayashi, which is cited as showing a semiconductor film comprising a flattened rod-shaped crystal, does not remedy the failure of Iwasaki and Inoue to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims.

Claims 21, 44 and 45 were rejected for non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over claim 5 of U.S. Patent 6,380,560. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection in view of the amendment to claim 21, in that the features added to claim 21 are not recited in claim 5 of the '560 patent or obvious from that claims.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant : Shunpei Yamazaki et al.
Serial No. : 10/753,524
Filed : January 9, 2004
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-
218003 / US3531/3615D1D1

The fees in the amount of \$420 for additional claims (\$300) and a one-month extension of time (\$120) fees are being paid concurrently herewith on the electronic filing system (EFS) by way of deposit account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 20, 2007

/John F. Hayden/
John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

07977-218003-amendment.doc